



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/748,164

12/31/2003

Motohiro Takano

Q79102

6958

7590 07/03/2007  
Koda & Androlia  
2029 Century Park East  
Suite 1140  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-2983

EXAMINER

COONEY, JOHN M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1711

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/03/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                          |                        |                     |  |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|                          | 10/748,164             | TAKANO ET AL.       |  |
|                          | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|                          | John m. Cooney         | 1711                |  |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) John m. Cooney. (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) William Androlia. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 26 June 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic, b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: All.

Identification of prior art discussed: All.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 JOHN M. COONEY, JR.  
 PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1700  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussion of proposed claims/claim language for refile/RCE filing wherein language was amended correct new matter and clearly set forth that the polyol of the claims is produced with an antioxidant. This amendment appears to correct new matter problems. The proposed amendment is intended to more clearly sets forth that the polyol is produced with an antioxidant as defined by the claims. However, examiner mentioned "...produced in the presence of and containing...", "...produced with and containing...", and "...synthesized with and containing..." as alternative language for consideration. Concerns still indicated regarding need to demonstrate that polyol being produced by the means recited, in fact, results in a different, unobvious product being formed. Further search and/or consideration still required.

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

#### Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

241A 3544

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

MOTOHIRO TAKANO, et al.

Serial No.: 10/748,164

Filed: December 31, 2003

For: SEALING MATERIAL FOR AIR-  
CONDITIONER

Group Art Unit: 1711

Examiner: John M. Cooney

## LETTER TO THE EXAMINER

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In accordance with our telephone conversation today, transmitted herewith is a copy of draft claims for the Examiner to consider as part of our telephonic interview to occur at 4:00 pm on Tuesday, May 26, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

KODA &amp; ANDROLIA

By: 

William L. Androlia

Reg. No. 27,177

2029 Century Park East, Suite 1140  
Los Angeles, California 90067-2983  
Tel: 310-277-1391  
Fax: 310-277-4118

## Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office Fax No. (571) 273-1070 on June 25, 2007.

William L. Androlia

Name

6/25/2007

Signature

Date

Proposed  
IN THE CLAIMS:

Claim 1 (canceled).

Claim 2 (original): The sealing material for air-conditioners of claim [[1]] 2, which when examined by the VOC measurement method as provided for in German Automobile Industry Association VDA278, has a value of total VOC content, which is an index to the degree of reduction of the emission of volatile organic compounds, of 300 ppm or lower.

Claim 3 (canceled).

Claim 4 (canceled).

Claim 5 (canceled).

Claim 6 (currently amended): The sealing material for air-conditioners of claim [[1]] 2, wherein the polyol is a polyester polyol produced with a polymerization initiator having a number-average molecular weight of from 400 to 1,000.

Claim 7 (original): The sealing material for air-conditioners of claim 6, wherein the polymerization initiator is a dimer acid.

Claim 8 (currently amended): The sealing material for air-conditioners of claim [[1]] 2, wherein the antiozonant is a diphenylamine-based polymeric compound.

Claim 9 (new): A sealing material for air-conditioners which comprises a polyurethane foam produced from material components comprising:

at least one polyol produced with a synthesizing antioxidant having a number average molecular weight from 400 to 586.8;

at least one isocyanate;

from 1 to 25 parts by weight of an antiozonant per 100 parts by weight of the polyol, said antiozonant having a number average molecular weight of 280 to 308.3 and being an aromatic secondary amine;

a catalyst; and

an antioxidant having a number average molecular weight from 400 to 586.8;

whereby the amount of volatile organic compounds emitted from the polyurethane foam is reduced.